

**REMARKS**

The Specification has been amended to correct an informality. Claims 5, 13, and 14 have been amended to address the Examiner's objections set forth in paragraph 8 of the Office Action. In addition, claims 5, 9, and 13-17 have been amended for the reasons set forth below. No claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, claims 5-17 are currently pending in the application.

**Priority**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and receipt of the priority document in the parent application.

**Terminal Disclaimer**

Claims 5-17 are pending and have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,713. Without admitting to the propriety of the rejection, the Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer and the required fee per 37 CFR 1.20(d) to avoid the rejection. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to deposit account 50-1417.

**35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wennmyr (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,615) in view of Read et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,620,279). Claims 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wennmyr in view of Read et al. and further in view of Skidmore (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,714). These rejections are traversed as follows.

The cited references of Wennmyr in combination with Read do not teach the invention recited in claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 12-17. Wennmyr and Read merely teach the generation and running of a plurality of programs asynchronously. They do not teach running the programs together, as recited in the independent claims 5, 9, and 13-17. The independent claims have been amended to emphasize this feature of the invention. Running the programs together is a very important feature of the invention that is not taught by Wennmyr, Read or any of the other art of record. Accordingly claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 12-17 are asserted to be patentable.

Furthermore, dependent claims 7 and 11 are additionally patentable over the combination of Wennmyr, Read, and Skidmore because claims 7 and 11 recite that the specifying means or

step specifies said "navigation program in accordance with authorization of a user." This feature of the invention is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Wennmyr, Read, and Skidmore because Skidmore is merely an analyzer for producing recommendations for code modifications and, therefore, Skidmore does not suggest that a navigation program, such as that taught by the present invention, would have a specifying means in accordance with the authorization of a user. Combining Skidmore with Wennmyr and Read for making such a rejection is hindsight construction and improper.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Gene W. Stockman  
Registration No. 21021  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: